



Marion Kelly <mkelly265@earthlink.net> on 09/24/2000 10:52:19 PM

To: Karen_Sprecher_Keating@ios.doi.gov
cc: Edward_K_Thompson@iosiscns1.ios.doi.gov

Subject: Draft Report Mauka to Makai

Aloha,

I am sending my comments to the Draft Report: From Mauka to Makai: The River of Justice Must Flow Freely, prepared by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice, Aug. 23, 2000, in the form of an attachment. I will send a hard copy, also. Mahalo, Marion Kelly.



Response_Mauka_to_Makai_J_Berry

Marion Kelly
4117 Black Point Road
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96816
Phone (808) 734-8238

September 23, 2000

Assistant Secretary John Berry
c/o Document Management Unit
Department of Interior
1849 C Street, NW, Mailstop 7229
Washington D. C. 20240
Fax: (202) 208-3230
(202) 219-1790
(202) 219-1989

Aloha, Mr. John Berry:

With your permission, I would like to submit the following response to your Draft Report "From Mauka to Makai: The River of Justice Must Flow Freely."

No. 1. Only thirty (30) days is not enough time for a response to your draft report. Please give us an extension. Sixty (60) days would be more realistic.

It has been over eight (8) years since the so-called Apology Act (P.L. 103-150) was passed by the United States Congress. You held the so-called "Reconciliation" hearings in Hawai'i only last December. We were promised by you that we would have your report by February 2000. It finally arrived six (6) months late. Now you are telling us to hurry up and submit our comments within 30 days of August 23, 2000! To give us only thirty (30) days is unreasonable and unfair. After the United States Government has taken eight years to take any action on P. L. 103-150, it is my considered opinion that the time limit should be extended from thirty (30) days to at least sixty (60) days.

We have been inundated with responsibilities to respond to the Akaka Recognition Bill, in its many, at least three (3), drafts, of which we have had great difficulty getting copies. The fact that the hearings for it came about the same time that your Draft Report was received did not make our lives any easier. Living in a colony is very difficult. We do not easily get material we need in order to comply with the colonizers demands. The fact that our oral testimonies were not and will not in the future be included in the final report indicts to us again that we indeed are a colony. If I understand correctly the statement in Appendix D., the written testimonies will only be available sometime in the future at specific sites. Your allowance of only thirty (30) days for our responses is completely unreasonable, especially when you have intentionally provided us with as little documentation as possible.

No. 2. Who wrote the "Draft Report?" Why have you chosen not to refer to the many oral testimonies that were made by those who spend long hours, waiting to be called upon. Your "Draft Report" has little, if anything to do with the hearings and testimony given on O'ahu in December 1999. I attended the hearings on O'ahu at the East-West Center's Imin International Conference Center on the University of Hawai'i Manoa Campus, and I see very little resemblance in your Draft Report to the testimony given at the hearings. It is as if the person who wrote the Draft Report was not at the hearings, or chose not to refer to any testimony that I heard given at

Imin Conference Center. I would like to know who wrote this "Report." Who is the author(s), or who provided the author(s) with the documents that are referred to in the "Draft Report."

No. 3. From the "Draft Report" I understand that none of the oral testimonies that were provided by the people of Ka Pae 'Āina (the Hawaiian Archipelago) to you are not going to be reproduced in the "Final Report." If this is true, I find this decision not to reproduce the oral testimonies made to your committee at the meetings throughout the Islands to be insulting and possibly manipulative, given the objections voiced at the December meetings to your "reconciliation" process. Was this decision made in an attempt to hide the feelings of the Kanaka Maoli people from members of Congress? They may not feel so supportive of the so-called Akaka Recognition Bill (S.B.2899), if they found out how many Kanaka Maoli feel about it and the whole "recognition" process they are being forced through.

These are not happy times for the Kanaka Maoli. After having their Hawaiian Kingdom overthrown by foreigners (most of whom were Americans), aided by the invasion of O'ahu by the U. S. Marines, who used their military power to support the traitors, there is again no hope for restitution. "Reconciliation" will not return the independent Hawaiian Kingdom government to the Kanaka Maoli people. At the least, you could have recognized their anguish by printing and making available all their heart-felt testimony.

Sincerely,

Marion Kelly
Professor, Ethnic Studies Department
University of Hawai'i, Manoa
(Ret. 7/30/00)